



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/732,543	12/07/2000	Yeejang James Lin	22503-715	4175
25096	7590	12/01/2005	EXAMINER	
PERKINS COIE LLP			WRIGHT, NORMAN M	
PATENT-SEA			ART UNIT	
P.O. BOX 1247			PAPER NUMBER	
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247			2134	

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/732,543	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LIN, YEEJANG JAMES	
	<b>Examiner</b> Norman M. Wright	<b>Art Unit</b> 2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 5-8 is/are pending in the application.  
     4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-4 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.


#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
     a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

  
**NORMAN M. WRIGHT**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/9/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 5-8 are present for examination.

#### ***Response to Amendment***

2. Claims 1-4 were cancelled by amendment, with claims 5-8 reciting essentially the same subject matter. Accordingly since the claims are drawn to the same invention the rejection has been maintained and the claim numbers changed to reflect the new claim numbers.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly by anticipated by Adelman et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,006,259, hereinafter '259.
5. As to claims 5-8, '259 teaches the invention comprising: a system/method, for VPN tunnel servers/network, host applications, a receiver request, clients, a processor, indications of loads, establishing a VPN tunnel (figs. 6, 8a-9), designating a tunnel, a traffic distributor, evaluation processor, at least performing a security functions, each VPN tunnel with characteristics, without host application involvement/user applications being executed, receiving request, routing request, opening tunnels, and updating the

Art Unit: 2134

map. See '259, abstract, summary, fig.1 [013, 105, 106, 107, 110, 114, 115, 118], fig. 2, [200, 205, 207, 211,225, 215], fig. 3-5, col. 1, lines 28-57 et seq., col. 2, lines 7-17 and 55-67, col. 4, lines 1-67, col. 5, lines 1-35 et seq., col. 6, lines 15 - col. 8, lines 67, col. 9, lines 1-10 and 35 –col. 10, lines 35, col. 11, lines 37-45, col. 12, lines 35-45 et seq., and claims 1-2,5, 8-9, and 16.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adelman et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,006,259, hereinafter '259, in view of Hoke et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,701,437, hereinafter '437.

8. As to claims 5-8, '259 teaches the invention comprising: a system/method, for VPN tunnel servers/network, host applications, a receiver request, clients, a processor, indications of loads, establishing a VPN tunnel (figs. 6, 8a-9), designating a tunnel, a traffic distributor, evaluation processor, at least performing a security functions, each VPN tunnel with characteristics, without host application involvement/user applications being executed, receiving request, routing request, opening tunnels, and updating the map. See '259, abstract, summary, fig.1 [013, 105, 106, 107, 110, 114, 115, 118], fig. 2, [200, 205, 207, 211,225, 215], fig. 3-5, col. 1, lines 28-57 et seq., col. 2, lines 7-17

Art Unit: 2134

and 55-67, col. 4, lines 1-67, col. 5, lines 1-35 et seq., col. 6, lines 15 - col. 8, lines 67, col. 9, lines 1-10 and 35 –col. 10, lines 35, col. 11, lines 37-45, col. 12, lines 35-45 et seq., and claims 1-2,5, 8-9, and 16. Not explicitly taught is the tunnel designator being separate from the server.

'437 teaches server designators/VPNM 160 that are outside of the servers, figures 1, and 4-8, see also col. 7, lines 7 et seq.. Additionally, it teaches handling request for routing and establishing new connection tunnels summary, and col. 7-9. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the invention of '259 with a VPNM that is outside of the server. One of ordinary skill in the art could have performed this modification by augmenting and adapting the VPNM management module of '437 into the invention of '259. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification because, a skilled artisan would have readily realized that you could separate the designator function away from a server without losing its functionality. And further because, '437 teaches the need for a VPN to service other VPNs to process data that is communicated across private network boundaries while allowing other data to bypass it (col. 3, lines 15-25 and summary, ). A person with such a desire in mind would have chosen a system such as the one disclosed by '437 as a means to accomplish VPNU control and the distribution of data to them. It also affords added security in that it prevents a single point of failure from shutting down the system (col. 4, lines 5 et seq.).

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 9/9/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The examiner does not concur that the prior art does not teach the use of a mapping table, accordingly see above for the specifics.

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

This is an RCE of applicant's earlier Application No. 09/732,543. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Norman M. Wright at telephone number (571) 272-3844.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Norman M. Wright whose telephone number is (571) 272-3844. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesdays-Fridays from 8am to 5 pm, and on alternating Mondays.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Greg Morse, can be reached on (703) 308-4789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 09/732,543

Page 7

Art Unit: 2134

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900

  
11/25/05  
**NORMAN M. WRIGHT**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**